

REMARKS

Claims 15, 28 and 34-35 have been amended and Claims 37-38 have been newly added; leaving Claims 15-38 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment. No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Claim Objections

Claim 35 is objected to because of informalities in lines 6-7. Applicants have amended lines 6-7 of Claim 35 and request the Examiner to remove the objection. Applicants submit that Claim 35 as amended is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 15, 28, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U. S.C. §112 second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended Claims 15, 28, and 34 and submit that Claims 15, 28 and 34 as amended comply with the requirements of 35 U. S.C. §112 second paragraph and request the Examiner to remove the rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 15-25 and 28-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Skaaning et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,535,865 (hereinafter "Skaaning"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections because Skaaning fails to disclose each and every element of Claims 15-25 and 28-34.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine Inc. v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988).

Claim 15, as amended recites, in part: "transmitting the fault symptom query corresponding to the next decision point and an option to view all of the resolution points to the user access device; receiving a reply to the query; determining if the reply includes one of the potential responses or if the reply includes a request to view all of the decision points; in response to determining that the reply includes one of the potential responses: continuing said transmitting, receiving, and determining until said one of the potential responses indicates one of

the resolution points or until it is determined that the reply includes a request to view all of the decision points, wherein if said one of the potential responses indicates one of the decision points then said one of the decision points is designated as the next decision point; and transmitting the fault diagnosis corresponding to said one of the resolution points to the user access device; and in response determining that the reply includes a request to view all of the resolution points: transmitting diagnostic images associated with each of the resolution points in the decision tree to the user access device, thereby allowing a user to diagnose a fault without having to respond to queries for traversing the decision tree.” (Emphasis Added).

Skaaning teaches an automated troubleshooter that uses Bayesian networks to troubleshoot a system. The automated troubleshooter suggests actions based on a stored knowledgebase. As depicted in FIG. 12 of Skaaning and described in the accompanying description in the Skaaning specification, the troubleshooting process (including the questions asked, the traversing through the knowledgebase, and the suggested actions) is directed by the automated troubleshooter.

Skaaning does not disclose at least the element “transmitting the fault symptom query corresponding to the next decision point and an option to view all of the resolution points to the user access device ... thereby allowing a user to diagnose a fault without having to respond to queries for traversing the decision tree”, as recited in amended Claim 15. In contrast, Skaaning teaches that the troubleshooter suggests an action or asks a question and then the user responds. The user can choose not to perform the suggested action(s). If the user performs the action or answers the question then the process continues until either the problem is solved or it is determined that the troubleshooter cannot solve the problem. In Skaaning, the troubleshooting process is directed by the automated troubleshooter and the user is not given the option to diagnose a fault without having to respond to actions and questions from the troubleshooter. (See, for example, Skaaning FIG. 12 and the accompanying description.) Skaaning does not teach that the user is given the option to “view all of the resolution points” “thereby allowing a user to diagnose a fault without having to respond to queries for traversing the decision tree” as recited in Claim 15. Accordingly, Skaaning does not anticipate Claim 15 because it fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 15.

Applicants submit that Claim 15 is patentable for at least the above reasons. Claims 16-25 depend from Claim 15, and thus are believed to be allowable at least due to their dependency

on Claim 15. Claims 28 and 34 include elements that are similar to Claim 15 and are believe to be allowable for at least the same reasons advanced above with respect to Claim 15. Claims 29-33 are believed to be allowable at least due to their dependency on Claim 28.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 26-27 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skaaning, in view of Buenzli, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,157,668 (hereinafter “Buenzli”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections because Skaaning in view of Buenzli fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 26-27 and 35-36.

As described above, Skaaning fails to teach or suggest at least the element “transmitting the fault symptom query corresponding to the next decision point and an option to view all of the resolution points to the user access device ... thereby allowing a user to diagnose a fault without having to respond to queries for traversing the decision tree”, as recited in Claim 15 from which Claims 26-27 depend. The addition of Buenzli does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, Skaaning in view of Buenzli does not render Claims 26-27 obvious because neither Skaaning nor Buenzli, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claims 26-27.

Claim 35 includes the elements “transmitting the fault symptom query corresponding to the next decision point and an option to view all of the resolution points to the user access device ... thereby allowing a user to diagnose a fault without having to respond to queries for traversing the decision tree.” As described previously with reference to Claim 15, Skaaning fails to teach or suggest these elements. The addition of Buenzli does not cure this deficiency. Therefore, Skaaning in view of Buenzli does not render Claims 35 obvious because neither Skaaning nor Buenzli, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the elements of Claims 35. Claim 36 depends from Claim 35 and is patentable for at least the same reasons that Claim 35 is patentable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Anne Davis Barry/

Anne Davis Barry
Registration No. 47,408
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: July 16, 2007